

REMARKS

Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of April 4, 2008 be extended two month, from July 4, 2008 to September 4, 2008.

Authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4364 is given to cover the extension fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 1 through 18 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

The Objection to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "computer readable medium," as claimed in claims 13-18. Applicant has amended the specification to define various known forms of "computer-readable media" that can be used in connection with the present invention. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the specification.

The §112 Rejection

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has amended the claims to remove the objected-to phraseology. Applicant is not conceding to the

Examiner's position regarding the adequacy of the written description; rather, applicant has removed the language because it believes the claimed invention is novel and non-obvious without it. In view of this amendment, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections, 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050014489 to Zhigang et al. ("Zhigang") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040001476 to Islam et al. ("Islam"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040019610 to Burns ("Burns"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Present Invention

Amended claim 1 of the present application recites:

In a remote device that is connectable to a server via a network, a method for providing local access to content stored on said server, comprising the steps of:

providing said remote device with a combination web server and proxy (WOX) residing on the remote device, said WOX mirroring said server;
whereby said WOX operates as a web server when processing an HTTP GET request and as a proxy when processing an HTTP POST request.

Amended claims 7 and 13 recite similar language.

The present claimed invention recites that a remote device that is connectable to a server via a network is provided with a combination web server and proxy (WOX) *residing on the device*. (See Fig. 4). When the remote device attempts to communicate with a server via a network through the use of GET requests and POST requests, those requests are processed by the WOX *residing on the device*. In the case of a GET command, the WOX operates as a web server and in the case of a POST command, the WOX operates as a proxy. As discussed on page 12, lines 12-16 of the specification, a GET command results in WOX acting as a local web server, with content being delivered directly from the WOX *on the remote device* to the browser *on the remote device* without accessing a network via a proxy. Additionally, as discussed on page 13, lines 2-6 of the specification, a POST method is moved to the local proxy of the WOX for processing and then the HTTP POST is proxied to the enterprise server and processed without use of a local server.

Providing a WOX that resides on the remote device and that can operate as both a web server and as a proxy simplifies the use of the mobile device by making it transparent to a user whether the remote device is connected to a network or not. Content is stored both on an external enterprise server and on the WOX (operating as a local web server), so it can be provided in response to a user request whether or not the remote device is connected to the external enterprise server. Additionally, because the WOX can operate as a local proxy, a user can transmit data from the remote device's browser to the proxy whether or not the remote device is connected to a network. As a result, the present claimed invention provides a mobile user simplified access to web content with transparency as to whether the remote device is connected to a network.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050014489 to Zhigang et al.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050014489 to Zhigang et al. (“Zhigang”) teaches a mobile terminal that simply acts a mobile web server. Page 4, paragraph [0042] and Fig. 3. of Zhigang teach that, in order for the mobile web server to connect to a client, the mobile terminal must connect through an WAP gateway 304 that may correspond to a conventional HTTP proxy 124 (shown in Fig. 1 of Zhigang). This allows content that is stored on the mobile terminal 302 to be accessed by an external client which can be a different mobile phone 310 or any other browser 308 connected to the internet. Importantly, Zhigang disclose only one location for content to be located, that is, terminal 302.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040001476 to Islam et al.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040001476 to Islam et al. (“Islam”) teaches, in relevant part, the use of cache memory to provide limited access to content when web access is unavailable.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040019610 to Burns

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040019610 to Burns (“Burns”) teaches, in relevant part, the use of a local host having web access via the internet as well as a local connection to limited content in a database (Figure 11).

The Examiner has not Established a *prima facie* Case of Obviousness

KSR (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007)) requires that an Examiner provide “some articulated reasoning with some rationale underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” Further, an Examiner must “identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does,” In addition, the Examiner must make “explicit” this rationale of “the apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed,” including a detailed explanation of “the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace” and “the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art.”

The Examiner has not met these requirements. As noted above, the present claimed invention provides a remote device with a combination web server and proxy (WOX) *that resides on the remote device*. Because the WOX resides on the remote device, communication between the WOX (on the remote device) and the remote device’s browser (using HTTP GET and HTTP POST commands) can be done locally, without having to access any type of network. This allows a mobile user to use the device in the same way whether or not the remote device is connected to a network. The feature of providing a combination web server and proxy which resides on the remote device, on which a browser locally accesses the WOX, distinguishes the present claimed invention as novel over the prior art of record. Additionally, the feature of the

WOX operating as a web server when processing an HTTP GET request and as a proxy when processing an HTTP POST request further distinguishes the present claimed invention as novel over the prior art of record.

Zhigang provides, in its most basic form, a mobile web server. The mobile terminal must connect through a WAP gateway to connect to a client. In essence, the server is mobile, and nothing more. Nowhere in Zhigang is there any teaching of, suggestion of, or hint of the need for, a remote device connectable to a server, and a method/system/computer program product for also providing local access to the same content stored on the server via a WOX provided *on the remote device* (the remote device that also accesses the content on the server over the network when available).

The addition of Burns and/or Islam does not provide the missing teaching or suggestion. The access to content provided by both Islam and Burns is limited to data that is cached, and as Applicant admits in the present application, the caching of data for local access is known and, more importantly, ineffective for solving the problem solved by the present invention, that is, essentially seamless access to the same content, either over a network from a server, or locally using a WOX integrated into the remote device.

The previously-made arguments pertaining to the previously-cited prior art apply equally to the newly-cited are, and are incorporated herein by reference.

For the reasons set forth above , each of the independent claims (Claims 1, 7 and 13), and all claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Zhigang in view of Burns and/or Islam, and are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

September 4, 2008
Date

/Mark D. Simpson/
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire
Registration No. 32,942

SAUL EWING LLP
Centre Square West
1500 Market Street, 38th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102-2189
Telephone: 215 972 7880
Facsimile: 215 972 4169
Email: MSimpson@saul.com